

cerity in the cause of justice is our concern for the resurrection of Poland no less, nay, even more, than the liberation of every other persecuted people.' These two statements deserve careful consideration. There is no doubt as to the Cardinal's feelings on the subject had he been alive to-day.

C.P.

LEGENDS AND HISTORY OF POLAND. By Edward Ligocki. (Nelson; 6s.)

This is an admirable little book, well arranged and illustrated. It begins, as such a book should begin, with the old familiar legends of the dawn of Polish history, the White Eagle of Gniezno, King Piast and the Angels, Popiel and the Rats and the ring of Princess Kinga. Then we come to history with Mieszko, Boleslaw the Brave, St. Stanislaus, and so on through the whole magnificent story, brilliant and tragic, down to the present day.

The illustrations are good in themselves and they illustrate the Text. It is a pity, in my opinion, that since the average Englishman speaks and writes of Sigismund and Sigismund Augustus, this familiar form of the name was not preferred to the less familiar Zygmunt.

The book is written in such a way that while any intelligent child could enjoy it, it should also provide the average reader with an admirable introduction to Polish history. It has rightly become the fashion to express sympathy for Poland, but sympathy is often ineffective if it is not based on comprehension. In the nineteenth century Englishmen were content to learn the history of Poland at secondhand from the Germans, and they began in consequence to take the partitions for granted. Of the grown age of Poland's history they knew nothing. It is necessary to-day for Englishmen to return to their native tradition. The verdict of Burke and subsequently of Macaulay on the iniquity of Poland's destruction was far nearer the truth than that of Carlyle and Lord Salisbury. To comprehend a nation it is necessary to know something of that nation's history, and to the history of Poland there could be no better introduction than this book.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS.

FAITH, REASON AND CIVILIZATION. By Professor H. K. Laski. (Gollancz; 6s.)

In his preface, Professor Laski tells us, that to do justice to the theme with which this essay deals, would have taken more time than a busy teacher can spare. It is remarkable that he devotes so much of the little time at his disposal to the reiteration of left wing clichés; as familiar to leftists as to their opponents. Certainly, they are presented with a professorial air; he does not say—'The Church is behind the times' but in saying—'it is difficult to believe whether any of the great religions has either the social content, or the intellectual adequacy, which enables it to satisfy the requirements of a

civilization as distinct from its ability to meet the problem of the individual who searches for a reply to the issue of pain and evil,' he gives the impression of time on his hands, to say the least of it.

We are informed that it is not difficult to believe that States like Poland, and institutions like the Catholic Church, will only adjust themselves with painful slowness to the thesis of the Russian Revolution. This statement would seem to imply a voluntary adjustment by the parties concerned, which, in face of present events, is palpably absurd. Poland's adjustment shows every indication of being fast and forceful, and the likelihood of a Commissar for Religious Affairs at the Vatican seems an extremely remote possibility.

Like so many of his party, Prof. Laski is convinced that everyone who is not an extreme socialist must have fascist tendencies. Accordingly, he castigates the Vatican for having allied itself to Mussolini, and its vagueness in criticising Germany. The Papacy, he insists, has been at all times backward in its support of the masses against their masters. Why does the Professor delude himself in these matters? The statements he makes are untrue, for there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. He would be well advised to use a little of his precious time scrutinising it.

English foreign policy also receives critical attention. Truly, it is not above criticism but against the acrobatics of Soviet foreign policy our own seems almost childishly straightforward. One almost feels sorrowful when pondering on the probable reactions of left wing intellectuals to the news of the Kremlin's recognition of the 'reactionary, semi-fascist Badoglio-Victor Emanuel Government' in Italy.

MAURICE McLOUGHLIN.

THREE RUSSIAN PROPHETS. By Nicolas Zernov. (S.C.M. Press; 8s. 6d.)

The three prophets are A. S. Khomiakov, F. M. Dostoevsky and V. S. Soloviev, who between them cover a century of Russian religious thought, the first being born in 1804, the last dying in 1900. Practically everything Dostoevsky wrote is available in English, and there has been no lack of writing about him in our tongue. Soloviev is still far too little known and only a few of his books are translated, though most of them are to be had in French. Of Khomiakov, very little indeed can be read in English; but his work on the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism is in French, as is what Dr. Zernov calls the best study of his life and thought, Gratieux's two volumes published in Paris in 1939.

Accordingly Dr. Zernov's account of Khomiakov is particularly welcome: the man who was poet, philologist, historian, journalist, politician, physician, engineer, sportsman and country gentleman, but above all philosopher and theologian—the 'father' of Dostoevsky, as Dostoevsky was of Soloviev, making the three-fold influence that was formative of that Russian religious thought that is